



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

would, of course, be necessary to inquire further into the integrity of this text. It has been said that, supposing the prose version to have been printed by Copland, "who died before 1570," the spelling has been modernized. This in itself throws suspicion upon the text as a whole, and possibilities of further editorial changes suggest themselves.

It is certain however that Copland did print a metrical version of *Guy of Warwick*, probably about 1560. If there is anything in the versification to suggest blank verse the fact should be known, for all blank verse or approximations to it at such a date, are important; if on the other hand, Copland's verse was in a different metre, or even in parts in the ten-syllable couplet, that fact should be known, to counteract the impression made by Professor Morley's introduction. But one cannot be far wrong in relying upon Tanner's description of Copland's version. It consists of one hundred and forty-one leaves; it is written—if the rest be like the first four lines—in four-accent couplets, and is printed from Auchinleck Ms. nos. 24 and 54. (Zupitza *a.*) I have not been able thus far to show that this actually describes the imperfect Copland print in the British Museum, but there seems to be little doubt that it is this print which is so described.

It is unfortunate that we do not know more about Copland. If it could be shown—and the burden of proof is heavy despite Prof. Morley's easy assertion—that Copland printed a prose version of *Guy* between 1545 and 1565, and that lines of very fair blank verse may be cut out of this version, then a codicil would be found to the legacy left by Surrey in his *Aeneid*, and by Sackville and Norton in *Gorboduc*. And with the possibility that here presents itself, it is doubly strange that Morley² did not refer to this rhythmical prose version

² Many of Copland's books were undated. Collier, in his *Extracts from the Stationer's Register*, London, 1848, notes the following:—*Adam Bel* etc., under Kynge's *Adam Bel*, entered 1557-8 (p. 15). *The vij wise Mrs. of Rome*, entered by Marthe 1558-9. Under this entry Collier says "W. Copland published 'the seven wyse Maisters of Rome' without date; but we know of no edition by Marthe" (p. 16). An edition of Copland's *Squire of Low Degree* was published without date before King's edition of 1560 (p. 27). In Copland's edition of *Juventus* a prayer for Elizabeth was inserted where Vele in his edition had a prayer for Edward VI. Un-

in his paragraph on the Italian *versi sciolti* and the beginnings of English blank verse in *English Writers*, vol. viii, pp. 61 and 214.

Some apology might be made for an extended reference to what, perhaps, should not be taken too seriously. But either something more is to be said about the first English blank verse, or else the statement of the late Professor Morley about a contemporary rhythmical prose romance of *Guy of Warwick* should be modified.

W. P. REEVES.

Union College.

NOTES ON HALL'S CONCISE ANGLO-SAXON DICTIONARY. II.

ACCORDING to Hall there is a word *egur* = *eagor*, sn. ?, 'flood, tide, sea.' If we look up the reference given²⁸ we find it to be identical with the *egur* glossing *dodrans* WW. 18, 20, which Hall has entered in the form occurring WW. 368, 29; 474, 4: *egor*, although he did not understand it. If we compare Byrhtferth's *Handboc*, 198 (*Anglia*, viii, 334) *dodrans oððe dodras þæt synt þa nigon dælas*, it would seem that *egur*, *egor*, represents the rest of the mutilated gloss *dodrans* { [*þa n*] *e-gun* [*dælas*]. } { [*þa n*] *e-gon*. } However, as we find WW. 225, 11 *dodrans i. malina egur* and C. G. L. v. 572, 21 *malinas maiores estus* (= *aestus*), and as there is a dialect English *eagre* (*egre*) 'the tidal bore' *egur* may be all right, after all, and *dodrans* a corruption of [*re-*] *dondans* = *redundans* that may represent the remnant of a former *aestus redundans unda i. malina egur*. Examples of such mutilated glosses are by no means rare.

Sweet, however, here (as elsewhere, when hard pressed for an explanation), had paid no attention to the Latin word at all, in fixing the meaning of the word, and Hall entered what he found. Under these circumstances it is a

der entry John Kynge, *Juventus*, Aug. 14, 1560, Collier says "Perhaps he relinquished his right [in the *Juventus*] to William Copland" (p. 29).

Collier gives one entry by Copland in 1560; three in 1561-2; three in 1562-3; one in 1563-4; one in 1565-6; and one in 1567-8. Copland's activity seems to have ended with the last year. *Gorboduc* was entered by 'Wylliam greffeth' in 1565.

²⁸ OET. C². 702.

real wonder that he did not propagate Sweet's blunder: *scyfel*, sm., 'instigator, god of war,' which refers to the same glosses on which Hall's correct entry: *scyfel*, sf., *scyfele*, wf., 'woman's hood,' is based.²⁹

But, in return, he took up Sweet's: *grundsofa*, wm., 'groundsoap' (a plant), which is another instance of arbitrary explanations. The form of the word as accepted by Sweet is on record in the *Corpus Glossary* (=WW. 11, 32 =Hessels' *Corp. Gl.*, C 186), and glosses there the Latin *cartilago*. The same gloss appears in the *Erfurt Glossary*³⁰ as *cartilago* gg. *grundsuopa*, and in *Erf*², not cited by Sweet (=Corp. Gl. Lat., v. 274, 35) as *cartilago grurzapa dicitur rusticae*. That a plant cannot be meant is evident from the lemma *cartilago*, which in the *Erfurt Glossary* (=Corp. Gl. Lat., v. 349, 45) had been previously interpreted as meaning: *næsgristlæ*, 'nosegristle.' It is natural that we should expect to find a similar interpretation in the gloss at issue. And in fact, the tradition of *Erf*. and *Erf*² point clearly in that direction. I see in *grundsuopa*, *grurzapa* a corruption of *gnurdsi(l)apa*=*gnurreds i lapa*; *gnur(re)dsi* I consider to be a past participle noun, formed by means of the suffix *-si (-se)*, much in the same manner as *toðonden-se*, 'swelling' (which Hall exhibits as *toðondenre* 'tumor') occurring in the *De Consuetudine Monachorum* (*Anglia*, xiii, 1084), and the word is probably connected with the *knurreds*³¹ we find in Stanihurst's *Aeneid*, I. 281: 'with steele bunch chayne knob clinged *knurds*³² and narrolye lincked;' *lapa* is the old form for later *læppa*, as we found *tafel* (*taful*) is for *tæfl*; *cartilago* is then well explained as 'gnarliness (gristliness,)' 'lappet (lobe,)' cf.

²⁹ Cf. *OET*, 568a.

³⁰ *Erf*, 312, *OET*, p. 584a=Corpus Gloss. Lat., v. 355, 24.

³¹ This is surely connected with *knarred*= 'knotty;' cf. also *knar*, *knarre*, =gnar, gnarre, gnarl, and German *knorre knaus*=Swiss *knus*; cf. also *cartilago knorsel-bein* quoted by Diefenbach, *Gloss. Lat. Germ.*, from a vocabulary of the 16th century; 'chondrosyndesmos ist eine verknüpfung der beinen die durch eine *knorspel* geschieht' (Blancard's *me. dicinisches Wörterbuch* p. 131, Bern 1710); the large 'gnaurs' or 'burs' met with in elms, etc. (Master's *Veg. Terat.*, p. 347).

³² Cf. also the game of 'Kibel and Nerspel' at Stixwold mentioned by Alice B. Gomme in *Dictionary of British Folklore*, Vol. 1, p. 298; the 'ner' is according to her a 'ball of maple'; *ibid.*, p. 313, she calls it 'knor,' and p. 421 'nur.'

Corp. Gloss. Lat., v: 493, 61: *cartilago speciem ossi habet non firmitatem ut sunt aures et extremitas costarum*. As to the gg. standing before *grundsuopa* in the *Erfurt Glossary*, that very likely, means 'græce,'³³ and points to a *condrus*=*χόνδρος* having dropped out, and this 'condrus' may have been the reason for the copyist getting muddled on *gnurred-se*.

If in the preceding instances Hall wrongly followed Sweet, he just as wrongly did not follow him in disregarding (WW. 23, 28) that the latter had clearly pointed out *fæx* as a Latin word; whoever wishes to consider it Anglo-Saxon, must explain it as 'hair,' and not 'dye,' as Hall recklessly does (*fucus* would then mean 'hair-dye'). He also recklessly jots down from WW. 40, 28, *fahame* 'potentum.' Now, Wülker prints *poLentum* which is the same gloss as 42, 19 *pullentum fahame*, that is, 'fine, bolted flour,'³⁴ and this *fahame* (*faha-me* formed like *blost-me*) is identical with the later *fam* 'foam.' Those who wonder how the word for *foam* may also be used to designate 'fine flour,' will please remember that '*fahame*' comes from *fawjan* 'to winnow, to cleanse' and means then properly 'purification,' that is to say 'putting on the one side the chaff and on the other the flour.'³⁵ One may aptly compare German '*Ausschuss*,' that may mean either 'scum, trash,' or 'choice selection.'

WW. 129, 39, furnishes Hall with an: *eardefæt*, sn., 'earthen vessel,' while the fact is that an 'eared' vessel is meant; read therefore '*earede fæt*' as already pointed out by Sievers.

WW. 289, 5, we have *proceris gearufang* which Hall has transferred, not understanding it. The word occurs again in the form *gearafeng*, WW. 183, 2, glossing *peeris*, and *gearafeng*, glossing *arpax*, WW. 107, 8, where there is added *uel lupus*. Now, if we compare *Isid. Orig.*, 20.15: *lupus quod et canicula ferreus*

³³ Cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 352, 45 (=Epinal-Erf. Gl.) *chorea* gg. *salutatio cum cantilena* (=chorea graece saltatio cum cantilena.)

³⁴ Cf. WW. 40, 11, *potentum smeodoma*, that is, *sme-godma*, properly 'examination.' *Ahd. Gl.*, 1, 380.25, *polenta melo cleinista*, that is, 'the finest, cleanest flour.'

³⁵ On a line with that it is when *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 382. 46 (=Ep. Erf., 823 Sweet) *pullis* (*pollis*) and *Corp. Gloss.*, ed. Hessels, P 541: *pollis* (=pollen-is) appears interpreted by *grytt*, that is, 'grits.'

arpax qui siquid in puteum decedit, rapit et extrahit unde et nomen accepit: arpax autem dictus quia arripit; arpe (read *harpein*) enim grece est rapere, it becomes clear, that WW. 107, 8 has preserved the true reading and we have only to properly divide, to get at the real thing; namely, *arpax* \bar{g} (= *græce*)³⁶ *earafanguel lupus* and this we have also to restore WW. 183, 2, and WW. 289, 5 we have to read *arpax*

\bar{g} *earu-fang*; { *proceris* }
g earu-fang; { *peeris* } is part of a different gloss that WW. 183, 2 and 289, 5 crowded out the proper word *arpax*; as to *earu-* (*eara-*), on account of Isidor's *ferreus*, one might be inclined to read *earn*³⁷ representing an *æren*, and it is possible that there were originally two glosses running like this:

arpe \bar{g} *earnfeng* (*earn fang*),

arpax \bar{g} *æren feng*,

and that *arpe* dropped out and then *earn feng*

= 'fowlcatcher' got mixed up with *æren feng* =

'brazen (iron) catcher,' 'brazen (iron) hook.'

Another of these puzzling entries is: *scyrft* 'scansio', *OET. Cp.*, 1799. Very likely this *scansio* is *scarsio*, a noun formed from the adjective-participle *scarsus* = *excarsus*, which is the Middle-Latin equivalent for *excerplus*; cf. the gloss of the *Vaticanus Christine regina* 1048 (sæc. X): *excerpta*: *escarsa* (Löwe *Coniect. ad gloss. Lat. spect.* p. 171); *scyrft* is then the noun of *sceorfan*, and of course means 'scarification'. Could Hall not see that WW. 181, 19, *horsa scip* 'ypoganus', must be *horsa scip* *hippegus nauis* (= *ἵππηγός* = *ἵππαγωγός* Thuc. 6, 42), that is, 'a boat suitable for the transportation of horses?' As to WW. 438, 16: '*honsteorc limpus*' (which again was bodily taken up by Hall), there we have probably another example of the proper word having been crowded out by one originally following; so that we have to read [*e*] *lumbis* [*h*] *onsteorc*³⁸ 'not strong,' *limpidus*

How ready Hall is to take up any word, be it right or wrong, just to increase the number of entries, of that I have already given several instances. Here are others: Wülker (WW.

36 Cf. WW. 171, 11: *infans uel alogos g unsprecende cild*.

37 *eara-* seems to be a form authenticated by Gothic *ara* and by *here* = *ere-* in the compound (*h*) *ere-fong* 'ossifragus,' WW. 253, 8; 460, 18.

38 This *hon* may be either *or* or *on* = *un*.

137, 30) exhibits *circulus uel uirgultum sprauta* and so Hall entered, but without citing his authority, *sprauta*, wm., 'slip, branch;' but Kluge (*Anglia*, viii, p. 450) tells us that the true reading is *spranca*³⁹ and so appears then by the side of the wrong *sprauta*, also the authentic: *spranca*, wm., 'shoot, slip, branch.' It is exactly so with the entries:

(1) *metesacca*, wm., 'a kind of measure, spoonful?' WW. 126, 35.'

(2) *metesticca*, wm., 'spoonful, WW. 126, 35; A. viii, 450.'

(1) is a reproduction of Wülker's wrong reading, and (2) the authentic form as pointed out by Kluge, *Anglia*, viii, 451. The meaning assigned to *metesticca* by Hall, is a mere guess. As the lemma, *legula*, is a corruption of *regula*, *metesticca* is, of course, 'measure-stick'; cf. German *Maass-stab*. To judge from the preceding, one might expect that he would give Kluge's *kæcewol* (*Anglia*, viii, 449) by the side of *kæcewol* 'exactor AeGl.' (= WW. 111, 9); however, I dare say, he refrained from doing so, as Kluge says he cannot explain this difficult word, but a look into Murray's *New English Dictionary* might have told him that we have to read *kæcepol* = 'catch-poll,' 'tax-gatherer.' But for his mechanical way of proceeding he would also have seen that what he enters from WW. 276, 25, *supe* (ic) 'sarcio' ought to be *ic siwea*⁴⁰ = 'I sew.' This confusion, existing between the forms for *p* and *w* accounts also for WW. 201, 35, *cauernamen wrong*, for which we find WW. 182, 14 the correct *cauernam pranga* = German *Pranger*. Hall, however, has only the wrong *wrong* which he failed to understand.

How imperfectly sure Hall is of the knowledge he wishes to impart, becomes apparent from his entry '*sealscyn amaracium*' WW. 351, 30. Under *sealh*, sm., he tells his students that the genitive is *sēales*; now, I should say, it would not have been difficult to recognize this *seales* in the compound *seals-cyn*, especially when he remembered the gloss WW. 267, 35: *amera sealh*; whence it is evident

39 Cf. also *accerspranca* 'ilex oaksapling?' which Hall cites from Ælfric's *Glossary*, which, however, I have been unable to trace.

40 Cf. *Ahd. Gl.*, ii 242. 1: *resarcio uiuidarsinui*.

that we have to read *ameracium seals-cyn* 'kind of willow,' but the word *cyn* has tripped him up more than once; witness the following entries:

accyn, sn., 'ilex' WW. 430, 6.

beancynn, sn., 'chickpea, vetch bean' WW. 205, 3.

crogcyn, sn., 'kind of vessel, winejar.' WW. 210, 39.

deorcynn, sn., 'race of animals.' Æ.

hrefucynn, sn., 'raven-species.' Æ.

pysecynn, sn., 'sort of pea.'

þorcynn, sn., 'thistle, thorn.'

In every one of these compounds *-cyn* conveys exactly the same meaning; namely, 'a kind of' and so *accyn* is, of course, 'a kind of oak,'⁴¹ as the 'ilex' really is; and so *beancynn* is a 'kind of bean', etc. That the *halsgang*, WW. 190, 32 (= *struma*), is a blunder for *halsgund* we know from Sievers, but nevertheless Hal exhibits: *halsgang*, sm., 'tumour on the neck.'

The Anglo-Saxon equivalent for recompense is according to Hall *wiðerriht*, but as the gloss on which this entry rests is WW. 118, 12 *hostimentum wiðerriht uel edlean*, and from *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 209, 2 we learn that *hostimentum* is the name for the stone that serves as counterbalance for a weight (*hostimentum dicitur lapis quo pondus exæquatur*), we shall have to read *wiðerriht*⁴² = *wiðerriht*,⁴³ synonymous with *ebnwege* (*æqui-pensum*) WW. 4, 21; cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 209, 1: *hostimento enalitat*, that is, *ecualitate* = *æqualitate*, *ibid.*, v. 209, 5: *hostit equat adplanat*.

'Within the bounds,' according to Hall's idea, the Anglo-Saxon expresses by *innihle*.

⁴¹ Cf. *Epinal Gloss.*, ed. Sweet, p. 1: A 31 *adilicem genus rubus=roboris*.

⁴² Hence read WW. 476, 5: *hostimen taefnung=uel æfnung for leasung*.

⁴³ I cannot help thinking that this same preposition *wiðer* is hidden in what we read WW. 18, 35: *wudumer*, 'echo' = *wudumaer* 'echo,' WW. 391, 20, The *Erfurt Glossary* (= *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 357, 19) has for that *echo wuydumer*. Hall, following Sweet, makes that 'a wood-nymph,' but the probabilities are that following the traces of the *Erf. Gloss.*, we have to read *echo wuyðirmer*, *wuiðirmer*, *wuiðirmaer*, that is, 'resounding word,' 'rebounding sound,' 'echo;' that is to say, *wiðirmer* stands for an original Latin interpretation like *resultatio vocis*, or something similar. (Cf. German *Wider-hall* and *Corpus Gloss. Lat.*, iii, 476, 54: *resultatio ηχῶς*; *Ahd. Gl.*, ii, 153, 10 *echo vox resonabilis*).

If we examine the gloss on the strength of which he makes such a statement, we find that what he has taken for an adverb, is in reality a noun, for there cannot be any doubt, that WW. 450, 21: *municipales innihle beborene* is a corrupt reading, perhaps for *incnihle*, [*in tune*] *be* (= *ge*?) *borene*; cf. WW. 310, 2: *cliens uel clientulus incniht*; 310, 4: *uernaculus inbyrdlingc*; III, 16: *inquilinus lungebur*.

On the authority of a mere guess of Bosworth, by Wülker there has been assigned the meaning of 'letter carrier' to the word *bædling*, occurring WW. 200, 19 as interpretation of a Latin *cariar*. This *cariar*⁴⁴ is evidently identical with the *carier* glossed *leno* we meet with *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 355, 8 and *canier leno* *ibid.*, v. 273, 40, with which one may aptly compare *Placidi Gloss.*, ed. Deuerling, p. 27, 17: *carisa uetus lena percallida*, unde *et in mimo fallaces ancillæ cata carisia appelluntur*. From these glosses it follows that *bædling* must be the equivalent for *leno*, and this is confirmed by such glosses as WW. 423, 32: *impulerit bædt*; ⁴⁵ a *bædling* is therefore an 'inciter to bæd deeds (profligacy),' a 'procurer.'⁴⁶ Cp. *bydel*.

Also a reproduction of a careless remark of Wülker it is, when about *undernmete*, after having learned that it means (1) 'supper,' (2) 'morning or midday meal,' we are told that (3) it may signify 'breakfast,' just as if 'morning meal' and 'breakfast' were not the same thing, and just as if it were not quite plain that in WW. 479, 3: *sub modio undernmete* the reference can not be to 'breakfast.' If Hall had not been so eager to avail himself of a new entry, he would have noticed that Wülker in his note wished to say that *undernmete*

⁴⁴ Cf. also WW. 479, 19: *angarizauerit beadaet*; 347, 10: *actus gebæded*; 374, 33: *compellere pact heo gebædde*; 428, 31: *impulsore bædedendre*.

⁴⁵ This form probably owes its origin to confusion of *s* and *r*; the *s*, having been omitted and later on added above the line, may have been mistakenly placed at the end by a later copyist. The stages of corruption would then be: *cariar*, *cariar*, *canier*. *Corp. Gl. Lat.*, v. 493, 47 we have this same *carisa* corrupted to *canier* explained by *seductor*, *leno*, *suasor*, and still more corrupted, *ibid.*, v. 493, 48: *canifer seductor*; but a remembrance of the right meaning is preserved in *carissa faba=vafra*, *ibid.*, v. 493, 55.

⁴⁶ Cf. also WW. 479, 17: *angurizauerit beadaet*; 347, 10: *actus gebæded*; 374, 33: *compellere pact heo gebædde*; 428, 31: *impulsore bædedendre*.

meaning 'breakfast,' can not be the right interpretation of *sub modio*, which is a quotation from Matt. 5, 15, and in fact Wülker (as well as Hall) might have seen that we only need to correct the slight mistake, *undern* for *under*, to set everything right; then we have *sub modio under mete* corresponding to what we read in the *Lindisf. Gosp.*, Matt. 5, 15: *sub modio under mitte (mytte)*, 'under the bushel.' To this same carelessness we owe the entry: *wermēt*, sn., 'man's measure, stature.' Just as if the word was a very common one, Hall cites no authority for it. And yet it is only a guess, based on the corrupt reading of WW. 479, 23: *ad stauram to wermete*, which ought to be *ad staturam to westeme*=*wæstme* as it refers to Matth. 6, 27. That *wæstm* means also 'figure, form, stature' Hall notes under *wæstm* 6., and it is confirmed by WW. 320, 4: *griffus, fīðerfote fugel leone gelic on wæstme and earne gelic on heafde and on fīðerum*.

Just as problematic as this *wermēt* seems the entry: *griðu*, sf., 'kettle, caldron,' which Hall took from Leo's dictionary without giving due credit for it. This is the more reprehensible, as the alleged word is based on a single passage in *Salom. and Saturn*. I am inclined to think that the word is identical with the *greoua* which is on record WW. 276, 14; 460, 36 as interpretation for Latin *olla*. Now as the Danish name for such a thing as *olla* 'earthen cooking-pot' is *gryde*, it seems probable that *griðu* as well *greoua* are but corruptions from *griðu greopa*. If *griðu* is all right, it may stand for *gryðu* and be a congener of Dialect German *Groppe* 'iron pot.' Nor is there good authority for such an entry as: *leac-leah-tric-trog*, sm. 'lettuce' (Lat. *lactuca*). The wrong explanation Hall owes to Sweet, for which he again gives no credit, and Sweet made up this explanation with utter disregard of the Latin word which *leah-tric* was to explain. The glosses where the word is on record are the following: In the *Epinal* and *Erfurt Gloss.*=*Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 353, 27: *corimbus leactrogas*; in the *Corpus Gloss.*, ed. Hessels, C 656: *corimbos leactrogas*=WW. 14, 35; moreover we have WW. 213, 19: *corimbus cacumen nauis leahrtroh*: WW. 365, 13: *corimbos leactrogas*. By the side of these glosses we have WW. 297, 18: *lactuca leahtric*; WW. 432, 7:

lactuca puðistel, leahtric. It seems to me quite plain that the *leahtric* of the last two glosses is simply the Anglicized form of the Latin *lactuca*, and therefore ought to read *leahrtuc*, and so cannot enter the question at issue with the above glosses. Now, of course, one might say that the *leactrogas* (*leac-leahrtrogas*) to be found there is also a blunder for *leahrtocas*, 'lettuce,' and if the word does not seem to conform to the Latin *corimbus*, '*cacumen*', that is to be explained in the same way that we have tried to explain several other glosses of a similar description, namely by supposing that *leactrogas*=*leahrtocas*, *leahrtucas* got into the wrong place and crowded out the true word explanatory of *corimbus*. But then, a lemma for *leahrtocas*, 'lettuce,' would have to be found, beginning with the letter *c* and that, I think, will be hard to do. I imagine, we shall get a more satisfactory explanation of the word when we compare such glosses as WW. 213, 16, 17:

corimbi i. uiti racemi uel botriones⁴⁷ uel circuli wingearð hringas uel bergan uel croppas bacce (read: *uel bacce bergan uel botriones croppas*);⁴⁸ and WW. 149, 6: *corimbi wingearða hringa*; WW. 149, 3: *capreoli uel cincinni uel uncinnuli. wingearða hocas þe hi mid binda* *þæt him nehst bið*; WW. 149, 19: *capreoli wingearða gewind*; WW. 118, 3: *capreoli wingearð bogas* (read -hogas); WW. 201, 30: *capreoli dicti quod capiunt arbores wingearð-hocgas* WW. 183, 3: *uncini hocas*; WW. 289, 11: *uncinos hocas*.

It will then seem not improbable that *leactrogas* is a corruption of *leac-hoggas*; that is

⁴⁷ Cp. C. G. L. iv 359, 33 *botriones caprioli*, *ibid.* 314, 35 *botriones latrices* (=truduces), *ibid.* 316, 29 *caprioli botrionis latices* (=truduces) *sunt*; iii, 621, 18 *corimbi idest butrione ederae* (=botrognæ hederæ).

⁴⁸ It seems to me to be admitting of no doubt that here as well as WW. 3, 21: *acitellum hramsan croþ*=271, 5; WW. 135, 24: *tursus, cimia croþ*; 149, 13: *cima croþ*; 202, 12, *caulon croþ*; 205, 12: *cipus* (=cepa s.) *croþlec*; 270, 25: *serpulum croþ-leac*, the *r* of *croþ* ought to be *n* (cf. WW. 434: 30: *lanugo wull croppa*); for *croþ-leac* answers exactly to German *Knopf-lauch* (*Knob-lauch*), and *hramsan croþ* would be a Bavarian *Ramsen-knopp*, 'head of garlic,' German *Knospe* contains the same word-element, as it stands for *Knop-se*= 'shoot, bud, eye.' So Anglo-Saxon *croþ* is a quite adequate rendering of such terms as the above *tursus*=*στροβίλος*, *turio* (for that is the true reading for *cimia* (WW. 135, 24) or *cima* (WW. 149, 13), *caulon* (=καυλιόν), for thus we must read in 202, 12.

to say, the glossator who explained *corimboſ* by *leac-hocgas* took the word in a wider sense, not limiting it to the runners and tendrils of the wine-plant, but accepting it as expressive of the 'hooks of any climbing or twining plant, as the bean, pea, wood-bine', etc.⁴⁹

As to what we read WW. 213, 19: *corimboſ cacumen nauis leahrtroh*, that is probably a corruption of *cacumen nauis t eahtho=t (uel) heahthu*; it may be that in the MS. from which the scribe copied there was preceding a *corimbi t capreoli t uncinuli t leac-hocgas* which contributed to the production of the blunder *leahrtroh* for *t heahthu*. As we read in the *Placidus Glossary* (ed. Deuerling), p. 25, 13 also of a *corimboſo aceruſ quos ruſtici ex congerie lapiduſ faciunt*, some one might be inclined to think that *leahrtroh* stands for *leahhreac* 'stone-rick,' and is interpretative of a crowded out lemma *corimboſ aceruſ lapiduſ*, and was misplaced to *corimboſ cacumen nauis*, which originally lacked an Anglo-Saxon interpretation. In *lea* we would then have the Anglo-Saxon representative of Old-Saxon *leia* =MHG. *leie* =Greek *λαῖα*. That would seem acceptable enough, as there is a parallel in Platt-Deutsch *Bult* meaning as well 'heap, hillock,' as a cluster of shoots growing from one stem (for example; *Nägelku-bult* = 'a cluster of pinks growing from a main stem.') Perhaps WW. 370, 12 *cartilago leaces heafod*, that is, 'head of garlic,' when compared with WW. 213, 19 *corimboſ cacumen nauis leahrtroh* and *ibid.* 213, 20 *coriza i. sternutatio cartilagines negebraec uel fuora* will furnish us the solution of the riddle: *cartilago* WW. 370, 12 stands evidently for *scordilago*, a derivative of *σκόροδον* or *σκόρδον* 'garlic' (cf. C. G. L. iii, 629, 42 *scurdone idest allius* (= *scordon id est allium*)), formed on the pattern of such words as *salsilago*, *lappago*, *plantago* (see F. T. Cooper, "Wordf." in the *Rom. Sermo. Pleb.* p. 81); the *cartilagines* appearing, WW. 213, 20, undoubtedly does not belong there, as it only disturbs the even tenor of the gloss *coriza*

⁴⁹ Cf. *Corpus Gl. Lat.*, ii. 223, 42: *ακρεμεων cima corymbus* iii. 263, 48: *ακρεμεων καρπον surculus, corymbus*.

⁵⁰ Unfortunately that is only Deuerling's, however, probable emendation of the corrupt reading of the MSS. *corineos-cormeos*; but there is a Lucilius (*jun. Aetn.*, 5) passage where *corimboſ* occurs in about the same sense.

(= *κορυζα*) *i. sternutatio negebraec uel fuora*; it may well be referred to the preceding gloss, which, I suspect, originally ran thus: *corymbus cacumen nauis uel caput scordilaginis leac-cnop*. As *sc*, *s*, *c*, *t*, and *d*, *t* as well as *p*, *b*, *h* and *n*, *r* are constantly mixed up in these glosses, *leahrtroh* may easily be read *leahcnob*, which developed from original *leac-cnop* 'leek-knob,' 'garlic-knob,' and would then be the counterpart to *leaces heafod* WW. 370, 12 cf. 205, 12; 270, 25. A contamination of *cartilago* 'cartilage' with *scordilago* (corrupted to *cartilago*) 'garlic' lies probably also at the root of the above mentioned gloss *cartilago grurzapa (grunzopa, grundsopa grundsopa)*. For, as it is also on record in the *Vossianus*, fol. 82 cited by Loewe, *Prodromus Gloss. Lat.* p. 418, a codex that does not contain any Anglo-Saxon interpretations, the view which I advanced above, saying that *grundsopa* stands for a mixture of Greek *chondros* with Anglo-Saxon *gnurredse*, is no longer tenable (cp. my article in the *Am. J. of Phil.* vol. xvii, No. 1, p. 85). As I have shown there, the mysterious *grundsopa* is now designated as Greek, now as rustic Latin. I, therefore, think that the original reading of the gloss was about this way: *cartilago chondrus graece, caepa dicitur rustice*, which is, as pointed out, contamination of *cartilago χορδρος* and [*s*] *cordilago caepa*. Since *s*, *c*, *e*, *o*, and *e*, *i*, *u* are frequently mixed up, it will become plain, how *caepa* can appear as *suopa* in the *Erfurt Glossary*. Hence it would seem that *grundsopa* has no standing at all in Anglo-Saxon. However that may be, so much is certain, there is no supporting evidence for a *leactroc*, 'lettuce.'

There is another error in: *bepung*, sf. 'deception,' although from the previous entry *bepæcung* 'lenocinium,' which means 'allurement, deception,' the truth should have occurred to him. *Swiðswige*, which he gets from Haupt's *Gl.*, 440: *heroico hexametro swiðswēgum mētrum*, he renders 'sweet sounding, melodious.' I should say *swiðswige* can but mean 'deeply silent;' while the adjective represented by that gloss is *swið swēge*, that is, 'strongly sounding, sonorous.' Hall does not understand the gloss taken from the same source '*conspiratio*' *gecwis*, and so simply transcribes it, and yet he knows that *facen-*

gecwis means 'conspiracy.' The latter is taken from Wright-Wülker (although Hall does not say so), 373, 11: *conspiratio facengecwis* *oððe andwyrðing*; WW. 512, 9: *conspiratio facengecwis*; 209, 40: *conspicatio* (= *conspiratio*) *i. conspirago facengecwys*; with these compare WW. 400, 2: *factio facn* (cf. 400, 19: *factio searu*); 400, 1: *factiosam pone facenfullan*; *gecwis*, I dare say, is a noun, formed from the root *cweð-* *cwið-*, in the same manner as *æss* from *æt-ti*, *sæs* (WW. 51, 31) from *sæt-ti*, *hæs* from *hat-ti*,⁵² and means 'oral compact,' which is, true enough, an indifferent rendering of 'conspiratio,' but will do, if the underhandedness of the plot is not to be emphasized; if it is to be, then of course, *facengecwis* is the more appropriate word.

With the following example, quite characteristic of Hall's method, this article may be closed.

After the verb *hentan* we find this remarkable entry:

'*hente* in phrase *be feore hente*, ON PAIN OF DEATH(!).' The 'phrase' occurs in the following passage of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* (EETS), vol. ii, p. 490 (xxxiii, 47): *Ac færlice ymbe ðreo nihte sende se casere his bydelas and bead þæt man swiðe georne scolde cepan cristeura manna and gehwa þær he nihte heora be feore hente*. The English translation opposite the text reads thus: 'But, suddenly, in about three days, the emperor sent his heralds and commanded that men should watch the Christian men very zealously and that each man should seize them, wherever he could, *on pain of death*.' Evidently Hall did not see that the translator's 'should seize them' stands for *heora* - - *hente* and *on pain of death* for *be feore*, = German *beim Leben*, but as on '*pain of death*' happens to occupy the same place in the translation that *be feore hente* occupies in the text, he rashly concludes that *be feore hente* is a phrase meaning *on pain of death*!

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

Hartford Public High School.

AN INEDITED DOCUMENT CONCERNING CHAUCER'S FIRST ITALIAN JOURNEY.

WHILE talking last summer with Dr. Furnivall

⁵¹ *Liber Scintillarum*, 107, 8.

⁵² Cf. Kluge, *Nominale Stammbildungslehre*, §128.

about Chaucer's first Italian journey, I got the welcome information that there were unpublished accounts concerning this journey in the Record Office, and the sound advice to search for them there. My hopes of a "find" were much reduced at learning that Prof. Skeat not only knew of the existence of the entry in question (vid. *Oxford Chaucer*, i, xxiv, note 67), but also knew in general its contents, so that when a curiosity to see the document, that would not down, led me to the Record Office I could but think that,

" . . I come after, glening here and there "

with rather less than a gleaner's chance. To my surprise and gratification the 'glening' turned out to be better than the harvest, for the roll contained the exact dates of Chaucer's first Italian journey, and his total absence reckoned out in days: one hundred and seventy-four, or six instead of the eleven months we have usually given him. I have already pointed out in *The Nation* of Oct. 8th, the change in the Chronology of Chaucer's "Italian Period" that these newly established dates appear to necessitate—in brief that the Italian period should be dated from the second Italian journey of 1378 rather than from the first—so that I am free now to print the document with only such comment as may serve to make its meaning clear.

The "Compotus" is found in the Roll of Foreign Accounts 42-51 Edw. iii fol. 41. I print it from a careful copy made for me by Mrs. M. B. Hutchinson at the Record Office, corrected in one or two instances from my own rough copy. Without the generous aid of Dr. Gross of Harvard, I should hardly have ventured to publish the document with its to me unfamiliar Latinity. He cleared up the meaning for me at many points. Blunders in the text, I trust not too many, are all my own, for he had no opportunity of revising the text as a whole. Fortunately the readings in the passages which concern Chaucer chronology are unambiguous. The document is here reprinted textually with no additions except punctuation. Letters represented by marks of contraction are printed in italic.

Compotus Galfridi Chaucer scutiferi de recipiendis vadiis & expensis per ipsum in